

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the remarks contained herein.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-4 and 22 will be pending in this application. Claims 5-21 have been cancelled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, their subject matter.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

Claims 1-4 and 22 over Moro in view of Mishima and Campbell et al.

On pages 3-15 of the Office action dated September 1, 2010 , the Office has rejected claims 1-4 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0095605 (Moro) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031 (Mishima) and U.S. Patent No. 6,504,622 (Campbell et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons given below.

The Office action admits:

However, Moro '605 fails to specifically teach a part of the plurality of compressing/expanding devices is allotted to compression operation compressing/expanding devices for compressing the image data and the other part or remaining compressing/expanding devices are allotted to expansion operation compressing/expanding devices for expanding the image data, and the compression operation compressing/expanding devices and the expansion operation compressing/expanding devices are operated in parallel, and concurrently the image data is transferred to all of the compression operation compressing/expanding devices as image data for second and subsequent prints.

Office action dated September 1, 2010 at page 7. In an attempt to cure this admitted deficiency, the Office turns to Mishima. However, even if the Office were correct that

Moro and Mishima were properly combinable, which Applicants do not admit, the

Office admits that this combination is still deficient:

However, the combination of Moro '605 and Mishima '031 fails to specifically teach concurrently the image data is transferred to all of the compression operation compressing/expanding devices as image data for second and subsequent prints.

Therefore, in view of Campbell '622, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of concurrently the image data is transferred to all of the compression operation compressing/expanding

Office action dated September 1, 2010 at page 9. Thus, the Office turns to yet another reference, Campbell et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that, even if it were proper to combine the reference teachings of Moro, Mishima, and Campbell et al. (which Applicants do not admit), the result is not Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants' claims recite that when the discrimination portion discriminates that the print job makes plural prints and the color/monochrome discrimination portion discriminates that the image data is monochrome data, then the compressing/expanding devices are operated in the first mode, i.e., a part of the devices are allotted to compression and a part are allotted to expansion, and these devices are operated in parallel. Applicants' claims also recite that when the discrimination portion discriminates that the print job makes plural prints and the color/monochrome discrimination portion discriminates that the image data is color data, the compressing/expanding devices are operated in the second mode, i.e., all of the claims are allotted to compression operations.

None of the references cited by the Office teach either alone or in combination, a discrimination between color and monochrome image data, and a

discrimination between single print and multiple print printing jobs, and a determination of how to allocate the compressing/expanding devices based upon the outcomes of these two discriminations. Instead, the Office has combined to disparate disclosures in different references that do not teach the overall control pattern recited in Applicants' claims.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for immediate allowance, and an early notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about this application, or believes that any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange for a personal or telephonic interview to resolve these issues prior to the issuance of another Office action.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 1, 2010

By: 

Bruce D. Gray
Registration No. 35799

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620